



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,338	12/22/2001	Earl David Brock	16,905	2861

23556 7590 04/05/2005

KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.  
401 NORTH LAKE STREET  
NEENAH, WI 54956

EXAMINER

KIDWELL, MICHELE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3761

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/028,338

Applicant(s)

BROCK ET AL.

Examiner

Michele Kidwell

Art Unit

3761

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 3761

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 14, 2005 has been entered.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 4 – 5 are objected to because of the following informalities: the application claims a combination of the diaper and the wipe. The term “diaper” lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klofta et al. (US 2003/0077307), and further in view of Pregozen (US 5,141,803).

With respect to claim 1, Klofta et al. (hereinafter "Klofta") discloses a system for improving skin health of a wearer comprising a disposable absorbent article that includes an outer cover, liquid permeable bodyside liner that defines a bodyfacing surface and that is connected in superposed relation to the outer cover and an absorbent body that is located between the bodyside liner and the outer cover (page 8, paragraph 89) and a skin care composition on at least a portion of the bodyfacing surface of the bodyside liner that includes from about 40 to about 95 percent by weight of emollient (page 2, paragraph 26; page 3 paragraph 32) and from about 5 to about 60 percent by weight of viscosity enhancer (page 5, paragraph 56) used in conjunction with a wet wipe as set forth on page 8, paragraph 86.

The difference between Klofta and claim 1 is the provision that the wet wipe include a nonwoven substrate and a skin care solution that includes from about 90 to about 99 percent by weight of hydrophilic solvent, from 0 to about 30 percent by weight of surfactant and from about 0.1 to about 10 percent by weight of extracted botanical active.

Pregozen teaches a wet wipe that includes a nonwoven substrate (col. 3, lines 18 – 22 ) and a skin care solution that includes from about 90 to about 99 percent by weight of hydrophilic solvent (col. 2, lines 7 – 8) and from about 0.1 to about 10 percent by weight of extracted botanical active as set forth in col. 4, lines 31 – 44.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the wipe of Klofta to employ the skin care solution of Pregozen because the skin care solution of Pregozen delivers active skin care ingredients to cleanse the skin while reducing a

Art Unit: 3761

slippery feel and protecting against contamination as taught by Pregozen in col. 2, lines 51 – 64 and col. 3, lines 18 – 22.

Additionally, the examiner notes that Klofta discloses that the delivery vehicles of the application may be used in any combination on page 8, paragraph 86. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had the motivation to include the skin care compositions on the wipe disclosed by Klofta. Likewise, the Klofta reference itself discloses the use of botanical actives as part of the skin care formulation.

With respect to claims 2 – 5, the examiner contends that Klofta in view of Pregozen disclose the claimed invention. The preference of applying the wipe before or after use of the article and/or using the combination once or more than once a day is an obvious matter of design choice that does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art because the prior art is fully capable of performing the claimed limitations.

With reference to claim 6, Klofta discloses an emollient selected from the listed group as set forth on page 3, paragraph 34.

As to claim 7, Klofta discloses the claimed viscosity enhancer on page 6, paragraph 61.

Regarding claims 8 – 9, Klofta discloses from about 5 to about 55% of beeswax as set forth on page 5, paragraph 56 and page 6, paragraph 61.

As to claims 10 and 11, Klofta discloses from about 0.1 – 55 percent of coconut oil as set forth on page 3, paragraph 32 and page 4, paragraph 42.

Art Unit: 3761

With reference to claims 12 – 13, Klofta discloses from about 0.1 to about 10 percent of cholesterol as set forth on page 3, paragraph 32 and page 4, paragraph 44.

With respect to claim 14, Klofta discloses a skin care solution with a HLB range of from about 7 to about 18 as set forth on page 7, paragraph 76.

As to claim 15, Klofta discloses a surfactant selected from the listed group as set forth on page 4, paragraph 37.

With reference to claim 16, Koenig teaches the extracted botanical active as yucca on page 1, paragraph 7.

As to claims 17 and 18, Klofta discloses from about 0.1 – 55 percent of coconut oil as set forth on page 3, paragraph 32 and page 4, paragraph 42.

With reference to claims 19 – 20, Klofta discloses from about 0.1 to about 10 percent of soy sterols as set forth on page 3, paragraph 32 and page 4, paragraph 44.

Regarding claims 21 – 22, Klofta discloses from about 0.1 to about 30 percent of glucose as set forth on page 3, paragraph 36.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the applicant's argument that the list provided by Klofta does not include absorbent articles and therefore does not teach a system as required by the applicant's claims, the examiner disagrees. The list provided by Klofta on page 8; paragraph 86 states that any combination of the above is suitable for use herein as a

Art Unit: 3761

delivery vehicle. Any combination of the above including wipes and bandages.

Bandages are in fact disposable absorbent articles that structurally meet the claimed limitations set forth by the applicant including an outer cover, a liquid permeable bodyside liner and an absorbent body located between the liner and the outer cover.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michele Kidwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30am - 2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Schwartz can be reached on 571-272-4390. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Michele Kidwell  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3761